

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent Application

5 Applicant(s): Cofino et al.
Docket No.: YOR920000151US2
Serial No : 10/620,407
Filing Date: July 16, 2003
Group: 3625
10 Examiner: Mark A. Fadok

Title: System, Program Product, and Method for Comparison Shopping with
Dynamic Pricing over a Network

15

REPLY BRIEF

20 Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

25

Sir:

Appellants hereby reply to the Examiner's Answer, mailed April 20, 2007
(referred to hereinafter as "the Examiner's Answer"), in an Appeal of the final rejection
30 of claims 1-22 in the above-identified patent application. Appellants find that the
Examiner's Answer is a reproduction of the answer that was mailed on July 11, 2006.
Accordingly, this Reply Brief is a reproduction of the brief that was mailed on September
11, 2006.

35

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in
Appellants' Appeal Brief.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

A statement identifying related appeals is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

5

STATUS OF CLAIMS

A statement identifying the status of the claims is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

10

A statement identifying the status of the amendments is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

A Summary of the Invention is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

15

STATEMENT OF GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A statement identifying the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

20

CLAIMS APPEALED

A copy of the appealed claims is contained in an Appendix of Appellants' Appeal Brief.

ARGUMENT

25

In the Response to Arguments section of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner asserts that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. The Examiner further asserts that, if the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

30

First, Appellants note that the statement made by the Appellants and cited by the Examiner reads: “whether or not the system disclosed by Herz is capable of being adapted to perform the cited steps, Herz does not disclose or suggest the cited steps.” Appellants statement was made in response to the Examiner’s assertion that Herz is capable of being **adapted** to perform the cited steps. Appellants note that being capable of performing the intended use, and being capable of **being adapted** to perform the intended use are very different. A system that is capable of **being adapted** to perform the intended use may, as in this case, require the addition of one or more patentable features *in order to be adapted* to perform the intended use. Appellants have also noted that the response specifically pointed out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes the structure of the invention from the cited prior art on page 11, line 21, to page 12, line 7, of the Amendment and Response to Office Action dated April 6, 2005. More specifically, Herz, for example, does not disclose or suggest determining whether the user chooses to receive bids on the one or more products described in the information, and adapted to create a bid request if the user chooses to receive bids on the one or more products described in the information, as required by independent claim 1. Thus, the Examiner’s point is moot since: (1) Appellants have pointed out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes the structure of the present invention from the prior art; and (2) the Examiner has only argued that Herz is capable of **being adapted** to perform the intended use.

The Examiner further asserts that, if the Applicant is claiming these features to be software, then they must be physically embodied on a medium in order to be statutory.

The features of the claims may be implemented in software, hardware, firmware, or a combination of the foregoing. Appellants also note that the preamble of the claims clearly states the category of the claim.

The Examiner also asserts that Ojha discloses a system and method that allows a buyer to create a shopping list and designate “whether a particular item will automatically solicit quotes from a plurality of sellers,” and that the bid request is sent to the plurality of sellers to solicit quotes over the network shown in FIG. 1 (col 9, line 37,

to col. 10, line 30).

As Appellants have noted, in the text cited by the Examiner, Ojha teaches:

5 when the buyer finishes specifying the product and clicks on "Go,"
a *search of a proprietary database* is initiated in response to which
relevant product information is presented in the form of a list of products
as shown in interface 500 of FIG. 5. Each entry in the list includes the
manufacturer, specific product information, and *a product price (e.g., the*
10 *"Lowest Price" column which displays the lowest list price from among*
*the **sellers*** selling the specific product via the transaction site).
(Col. 9, lines 37-45; emphasis added.)

Ojha teaches, therefore, that the proprietary database contains a
compilation of information from a number of sellers, e.g. the "Lowest Price." In the text
cited by the Examiner in the Response to Arguments section, Ojha does disclose
designating "whether a particular item will automatically solicit quotes from a plurality of
15 sellers." Appellants, however, could find *no* disclosure by Ojha that the bid request is
"sent to the plurality of sellers to *solicit quotes over the network* shown in Figure 1," as
asserted by the Examiner. Thus, Ojha does *not* disclose or suggest that a bid request is
sent to one or more stores or over one or more network interfaces.

Thus, Herz et al. and Ojha et al., alone or in combination, do not disclose
20 or suggest a bid agent process adapted to determine whether the user chooses to receive
bids on the one or more products and adapted to *create a bid request* if the user chooses
to receive bids on the one or more products described in the information; and a broker
that *sends the bid request over one or more of the network interfaces to one or more*
stores, and wherein the broker receives bids from the stores and resends the bids over one
25 or more of the network interfaces to a user, as required by independent claim 1, do not
disclose or suggest determining whether the user chooses to receive bids on the one or
more selected products described in the information; *creating a bid request* if the user
chooses to receive bids on the one or more selected products described in the
information; *sending a bid request over one or more network interfaces to one or more*
30 *stores, the bid request requesting a bid on the one or more selected products and at least*
one of the one or more related products; and *receiving bids from the stores* and resending
the bids over one or more of the network interfaces to a user, as required by independent

claims 20 and 21, and do not disclose or suggest a bid agent process that determines whether the user chooses to receive bids on the one or more products described in the information, *where the bid agent process prepares a bid request* when the user chooses to receive bids on the one or more products described in the information, and *where the bid agent process communicates the bid request over the one or more network interfaces and communicates to the user any bids received over the one or more network interfaces*, as required by independent claim 22.

The Examiner also notes that Issa was not relied upon for the cited limitation. The Examiner further notes that Issa does state that “each seller is presented with a set of continually variable data, automatically and dynamically compiled from the aggregate of placed orders.” (Paragraph 0139). The Examiner asserts that this suggests that multiple sellers are solicited to bid on orders or requests.

As Appellants have noted, Issa is directed to an Internet auction method, system and computer site where independent and/or unrelated buyers are automatically pooled to buy products/services as a group in order to entice competitive bidding from pre-approved sellers who take advantage of the large group sales to bid (offer) discounts. (See, Abstract.) Regarding the Examiner’s assertion that multiple sellers are solicited to bid on orders or requests, Appellants note that the set of continually variable data taught by Issa is actually *information on the bidding process* provided to sellers; Issa, however, does **not** teach to send a *bid request*. Thus, Issa does not address the issue of sending a bid request to one or more stores or over one or more network interfaces.

Thus, Issa does not disclose or suggest a bid agent process adapted to determine whether the user chooses to receive bids on the one or more products and adapted to *create a bid request* if the user chooses to receive bids on the one or more products described in the information; and a broker that *sends the bid request over one or more of the network interfaces to one or more stores*, and *wherein the broker receives bids from the stores* and resends the bids over one or more of the network interfaces to a user, as required by independent claim 1, does not disclose or suggest determining whether the user chooses to receive bids on the one or more selected products described in the information; *creating a bid request* if the user chooses to receive bids on the one or

more selected products described in the information; *sending a bid request over one or more network interfaces to one or more stores*, the bid request requesting a bid on the one or more selected products and at least one of the one or more related products; and *receiving bids from the stores* and resending the bids over one or more of the network interfaces to a user, as required by independent claims 20 and 21, and does not disclose or suggest a bid agent process that determines whether the user chooses to receive bids on the one or more products described in the information, *where the bid agent process prepares a bid request* when the user chooses to receive bids on the one or more products described in the information, and *where the bid agent process communicates the bid request over the one or more network interfaces and communicates to the user any bids received over the one or more network interfaces*, as required by independent claim 22.

Conclusion

The rejections of the cited claims under sections 102 and 103 in view of Herz et al., Ojha et al , and Issa, alone or in any combination, are therefore believed to be improper and should be withdrawn. The remaining rejected dependent claims are believed allowable for at least the reasons identified above with respect to the independent claims.

The attention of the Examiner and the Appeal Board to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully,



Date: June 20, 2007

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560

APPENDIX

1. A computer system for comparison shopping over one or more networks, the system comprising:

5 one or more central processing units (CPUs), one or more memories, and one or more network interfaces in communication with one or more networks;

a bid agent process adapted to determine whether one or more products are described in information communicated to a user, where the bid agent process is further adapted to determine whether the user chooses to receive bids on the one or more
10 products described in the information and adapted to create a bid request if the user chooses to receive bids on the one or more products described in the information; and

a broker that sends the bid request over one or more of the network interfaces to one or more stores, the broker using one or more values of a closeness measure to determine one or more related products associated with a selected product,
15 where the one or more values of the closeness measure are determined using attributes of the selected product and the one or more related products, the bid request requesting a bid on the selected product and at least one of the one or more related products, and wherein the broker receives bids from the stores and resends the bids over one or more of the network interfaces to a user.

20 2. A system, as in claim 1, where the bid request has a bid protocol, and where the bid protocol includes a product identifier and a bid price.

3. A system, as in claim 1, where one or more of the stores re-bids if the user
25 rejects a prior bid.

4. A system, as in claim 1, where one or more of the stores combines a product with one or more second store products when submitting a corresponding bid.

5. A system, as in claim 1, where one or more of the bids have one or more conditions.

6. A system, as in claim 1, where the bid agent process transmits the bid request to the broker.

7. A system, as in claim 6, where the bid agent process further sends one or more bid lists to the user, the one or more bid lists containing bids from one or more of the stores about the selected product and bids from one or more of the stores about the at least one of the one or more related products.

8. A system, as in claim 6, wherein the broker compiles the bids from the stores into a bid list, and sends the bid list to the bid agent process.

9. A system, as in claim 6, where the bid agent process notifies the user that the bid request is ready for the one or more products described in a Web page, whereby the user can consent to submission by the bid agent process of the bid request to the one or more stores.

10. A system, as in claim 1, where the broker determines the one or more values of the closeness measure, and where the broker determines the one or more related products by determining that the one or more values of the closeness measure corresponding to the one or more related products are smaller than a replacement factor.

11. A system, as in claim 1, where the broker determines the one or more values of the closeness measure, and where the broker determines each value of the closeness measure by determining weighted attributes by multiplying attributes of the selected product and the one or more related products by predetermined weight factors, the broker further determining each value of the closeness measure by determining a sum of differences between weighted attributes for the selected product and weighted

attributes for one of the one or more related products.

12. A system, as in claim 1, where the one or more values of the closeness
measure are stored in the one or more memories and at least one of the one or more
5 values of the closeness measure has been previously determined.

13. A system, as in claim 1, where the closeness measure is a distance

14. A system, as in claim 5, where the conditions included any one or more of
10 the following: a selected product price, a shipping method, a shipping time, a handling
method, a product packaging, a set of product delivery instructions, a provision of better
deals for bundling two or more products, a recommendation of comparable products,
related products, or both, a provision of customer service programs including express
checkout in online stores, wish lists, gift registries, reward programs, discount for certain
15 shopping groups, custom-configurable products, and email notification services

15. A system, as in claim 14, where the one or more related products include
any one or more of the following: a replacement product, an up-sell product, a down-sell
product, a cross-sell product, a combination product to be used with the selected product,
20 an alternative or substitute product, and a product with a related use.

16. A system, as in claim 1, where the user consents to receiving bids from the
stores before the bids from all the stores are sent.

25 17. A system, as in claim 1, where a history of the bids is stored in one or
more of the memories.

18. A system, as in claim 17, where the stored bids are used for a later bid
request.

19. A system, as in claim 1, where the broker determines the stores from which to solicit the bids.

20. A method for comparison shopping over a network comprising the steps of:

determining whether one or more selected products are described in information communicated to a user;

determining whether the user chooses to receive bids on the one or more selected products described in the information;

creating a bid request if the user chooses to receive bids on the one or more selected products described in the information;

using one or more values of a closeness measure to determine one or more related products associated with the one or more selected products, where the one or more values of the closeness measure are determined using attributes of the one or more selected products and the one or more related products;

sending a bid request over one or more network interfaces to one or more stores, the bid request requesting a bid on the one or more selected products and at least one of the one or more related products; and

receiving bids from the stores and resending the bids over one or more of the network interfaces to a user.

21. A computer program product performing the steps of:

determining whether one or more selected products are described in information communicated to a user;

determining whether the user chooses to receive bids on the one or more selected products described in the information;

creating a bid request if the user chooses to receive bids on the one or more selected products described in the information;

using one or more values of a closeness measure to determine one or more related products associated with the one or more selected products, where the one or

more values of the closeness measure are determined using attributes of the one or more selected products and the one or more related products;

5 sending the bid request over one or more network interfaces to one or more stores, the bid request requesting a bid on the one or more selected products and at least one of the one or more related products; and

 receiving bids from the stores and resending the bids over the one or more network interfaces to a user.

22. A computer system for comparison shopping over one or more networks,
10 the system comprising:

 one or more central processing units (CPUs), one or more memories, and one or more network interfaces in communication with one or more networks; and

15 a bid agent process that determines whether one or more products are described in information communicated to a user, where the bid agent process determines whether the user chooses to receive bids on the one or more products described in the information, where the bid agent process prepares a bid request when the user chooses to receive bids on the one or more products described in the information, and where the bid agent process communicates the bid request over the one or more network interfaces and communicates to the user any bids received over the one or more network interfaces.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

There is no evidence submitted pursuant to § 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or entered by the Examiner and relied upon by appellant.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

There are no known decisions rendered by a court or the Board in any proceeding identified pursuant to paragraph (c)(1)(ii) of 37 CFR 41.37.